Governor's Commission for a Drug Free Indiana

A Division of the



Comprehensive Community Plan

County: Fayette

LCC: Fayette County Drug Abuse Prevention Coalition

Date: December 13, 2006



Contact: Kathryn Schlichte

Address: 4012 N. Winding Creek Rd.

City: Connersville

Zip Code: 47331

Phone: 765-825-7047

Email: rkslick@verizon.net

County Commissioners:

Mark Nobbe, David Devor,

Address: 401 Central Avenue

City: Connersville

Zip Code: 47331

Plan Summary

Mission Statement: The Fayette County Drug Abuse Prevention Coalition's mission is to effectively pool our mutual interest, concern, and resources to develop and implement programs that will identify, contain, reduce and eliminate substance abuse and provide necessary help for those currently in need. The members of our coalition believe that substance abuse not only leads to personal tragedy, but it weakens and undermines the community and lessens the quality of life for everyone in Fayette County.

History: The Fayette County Drug Abuse Prevention Coalition was founded in September 1988. This coalition formed with the idea of bringing together members of the community to address and solve the problems of substance abuse in Fayette County.

Since its inception, the Local Coordinating Council (LCC) has been a functional part of the community. Members of the LCC participated in several area groups I an effort to address communication problems between governmental, educational and law enforcement agencies in regards to substance abuse issues. LCC member have also served on councils that are indirectly related to substance abuse such as child abuse and teen pregnancy groups.

There have been several attempts to coordinate community efforts by several organizations (i.e. Step Ahead, Extension Office, Drug Coalition) with little results, but this interest is still alive. The LCC is willing to participate in any endeavor that may/will aid in the accomplishment of our mission statement.

Several years ago the LCC became involved in the Whitewater Valley Care Pavilion's Advisory Council. Once again, this organization consists of community representatives and has a goal of helping the community. This council has met quarterly with sub-committees meeting more often if necessary. At one time this council published of a Teen Yellow Pages, listing activities for teens to do in this community. Several members of the LCC were a part of this venture.

In recent years, the membership of the Fayette County Drug Abuse Prevention Coalition has declined. With decreasing membership, our productivity has also decreased. Achieving the goals of our comprehensive plan has been challenging. The current board hopes to reinvent rejuvenate the coalition.

This comprehensive plan covers Fayette County, Indiana. The county seat is Connersville. This plan is directed at the 25, 000 plus citizens of Fayette County. Several small cities/towns are within Fayette County: Alpine, Everton, Lyonsville, Springersville, Waterloo, Bentonville, Nulltown, Orange, Glenwood, Falmouth, Fairview, and Alquina.



Connersville, Fayette County, is located 57 miles southeast of Indianapolis, 52 miles northwest of Cincinnati, and 216 miles southeast of Chicago, Illinois. Interstate 70 is just fifteen miles north while Interstate 74 is thirty miles south of Connersville. Fayette County is at the crossroads of America and is located directly in main transit line of drug trafficking activity.

Summary of the Comprehensive Community Plan: In Fayette County's 2006 Comprehensive Plan there is a problem statement each of the three categories: prevention/education, treatment/intervention, justice/law enforcement.

(1) The use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs among elementary, middle and high school students in Fayette County exceeds the Indiana norms. (2) There is a need for a comprehensive treatment plan throughout Fayette County for alcohol and drug abuse. There is an insufficient number of available funds and treatment programs within Fayette County to service adults and children. (3) Drug use and dealing is on the rise in Fayette County. There is a need for additional law enforcement throughout the community.



Membership List

County LCC Name: Fayette

Name	Organization	Race	Gender	Category
Cindy	Fayette County	white	female	prevention/education
Troxell	School Corp.			_
Jeff Lang	Indiana Excise	white	male	justice/law
	Police			enforcement
Craig	Connersville	white	male	justice/law
Pennington	Police Dept.			enforcement
Kathryn	Fayette County	white	female	prevention/education
Schlichte	School Corp.			
Bobby	Fayette County	white	male	justice/law
Revalee	Sheriff Dept.			enforcement
Scott Shook	Connersville	white	male	justice/law
	Police Dept.			enforcement
Scott West	Fayette County	white	male	prevention/education
	School Corp.			
Janice	Community	white	female	citizen
Wilson				
Jennifer	Fayette County	white	female	treatment/intervention
McGuire	Child			
	Protection			
D 11:	Services	1 • 4	C 1	
Debbie	Creative	white	female	treatment/intervention
Shain Jack	Counseling	white	male	
Hopkins	Fayette County	wnite	maie	prevention/education
Pam Noble	School Corp. Fayette County	white	female	prevention/education
Faili Nobie	School Corp.	willte	lemaie	prevention/education
Tony	Fayette County	white	male	prevention/education
Elleman	School	wille	maie	prevention/education
Lifeman	Corporation			
Janet	- Joi poi activit	white	female	treatment/intervention
Malone				
Cynthia	Community	white	female	justice/law
Crispin	J			enforcement
Billy	Fayette County	white	male	justice/law
Wayson	Sheriff Dept.			enforcement
Kay	Creative	white	female	treatment/intervention
Rosenberger	Counseling			
Rick	Whitewater	white	male	treatment/intervention
Callahan	Valley Care			
	Pavilion			



Eric Myers	Fayette County School Corp.	white	male	prevention/education
Beth Bishop	Fayette County School Corp.	white	female	prevention/education
Rob Judd	Whitewater Valley Care Pavilion	white	male	treatment/intervention
Rhonda Friend	Dunn Center	white	female	treatment/intervention



Problem Identification

Problem Statement #1: The use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs among elementary, middle and high school students in Fayette County exceeds the Indiana averages.

Supportive Data:

- 6th- 10 graders (2003) higher than state average for cigarette, cigars, smokeless tobacco, inhalants, pills (Ritalin/LSD).
- ATOD incidents resulting in suspension and/or expulsion have risen at CHS: 2006-07—18; 2005-06—23; 2004-05—8
- 1 student used 3 strikes for high school for ATOD
- Students at CMS have been involved with ATOD resulting in suspensions and/or expulsions. 2005-06—32 (3 pills, 7 tobacco, 12 marijuana, 1 alcohol, and 9 multiple substances); 2004-06—57 (12 tobacco, 45 multiple substances)
- There has been an increase in number of incidents involving pills at school.
- Voluntary drug testing participation has increased or remained constant.

Ye	ear 1 Update:
	•
Ye	ear 2 Update:
	•
Fi	nal Update:

Objectives:

- Continue drug testing programs at CMS and CHS.
- School health curriculum continues to address issues of ATOD.
- Strong non-use policy for students, visitors and school personnel.
- Random K-9 unit walk through buildings on a more frequent basis.
- Full-time uniformed officer in facility at CHS and CMS.
- Implement Ruff and Community Awareness Programs.



- CMS cameras on 2nd and 3rd floors needed and exterior cameras
- More communication devices (radios) needed
- Red Ribbons Activities
- High school to offer an after prom alternative
- Convocations- Rick Stoddard

Ye	ar 1 Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•
Ye	ar 2 Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•
Fi	nal Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•

Goals:

- Reduce the annual ATOD use among school age population by 5% as measured by suspensions and expulsions.
- ATOD use among school age population will be less than or equal to the state average as evidenced by the survey conducted by the Indiana Prevention Resource Center on a tri-annual basis.

Ye	ear 1 Annual Benchmarks:
Ye	ear 2 Annual Benchmarks:
Fi	nal Report:



Problem Statement #2: There is a need for a comprehensive treatment plan throughout Fayette County for alcohol and drug abuse. There is an insufficient number of available funds and treatment programs within Fayette County to service adults and children.

Supportive Data:

- Fayette County DCS Average of 15 interventions per month for drug/alcohol related incidents.
- Meridian Services- 471 Drug and Alcohol Cases in the six county area which it serves.
- Dunn Mental Health- 40 students went through Saturday SAFE program for drugs and alcohol.
- No local inpatient facility for drug and alcohol issues.
- No student self-help groups available for teens such as Alateen.
- RATS Program- 6 referrals from high school, 42 from juvenile probation, 12 parents, 10 mental health providers, 30 participated in 2005; 15 referrals in 2006. CMS 05-06 32 students to RATS.
- CMS 2001-02 11 suspensions for drugs, 2004-05 57 suspensions for drugs
- Creative Counseling- 58 youth & adults for ATOD in 2005; 36 to date for ATOD in 2006

Ye	ear 1 Update:
Ye	ar 2 Update:
	•
	•
Fi	nal Update:

Objectives:

- Continue to offer TEG and TAP Tobacco programs at CHS.
- Assist in locating funding for treatment programs throughout community.



- Promote development of self-help support groups for teenagers such as Alateen.
- Meet with local mental health agencies to develop treatment programs to meet needs of community.
- Revise the school drug-testing program to include some component for treatment and assessment and follow-up.

Ye	ar 1 Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•
Ye	ar 2 Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•
Fi	nal Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•

Goals:

- Increase annual participation in local treatment programs.
- Increase the number of individuals who successfully complete treatment programs each year.



Ye	ear 1 Annual Benchmarks:
Ye	ear 2 Annual Benchmarks:
	•
Fi	nal Report:
	•



Problem Statement #3: Drug use and dealing is on the rise in Fayette County. There is a need for additional law enforcement throughout the community.

Supportive Data:

- There has been an increase in the number of meth lab charges in 2006. 2005--8; 2006--12
- There has been an increase in the number of tobacco violations at Fayette County High School. 2005--1; 2006--3
- Charges involving the possession of marijuana have increased. 2005--87; 2006--92
- In the first eight months of 2006 there were 698 ATOD charges in Fayette County (3—tobacco, 259—drugs, 436—alcohol). In the twelve months of 2005, there were 962 ATOD charges (1—tobacco, 324 drugs, 637—alcohol). If the rate of charges is constant during the last half of 2006, the total amount of charges in 2006 will surpass 2005.

Ye	ar 1 Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•
Ye	ar 2 Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•
Fi	nal Update:
	•
	•
	•
	•

Objectives:

- Provide training for officers in interdiction process.
- Provide additional resources through funding to assist in ATOD arrests for law enforcement agencies.
- Work with RUFF Task Force to increase collaboration among law enforcement agencies.
- Continue implementing the Meth Watch Program throughout the community.



Y	ear 1 Update:
	•
Y	ear 2 Update:
	•
	•
	•
Fi	nal Update:
	•
	•
	•
(An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County
(• An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County.
	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year.
	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year.
	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year.
	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year.
	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year.
Y	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year.
Y	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: • • • •
Y	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: • • • •
Y	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: • • • •
Y	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: • • • •
Ye	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: • • • •
Ye	An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. Annual Benchmarks: ar 2 Annual Benchmarks: ar 2 Annual Benchmarks: . .
Ye	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. Ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: ear 2 Annual Benchmarks: ear 2 Annual Benchmarks: In al Report:
Ye	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. Ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: ear 2 Annual Benchmarks: ear 2 Annual Benchmarks: In al Report:
Ye	 An annual decrease in the number of ATOD charges in Fayette County. Maintain or reduce the number of meth lab charges in Fayette County over the course of a year. Ear 1 Annual Benchmarks: ear 2 Annual Benchmarks: ear 2 Annual Benchmarks: In al Report:



Please attach the County's Fiscal Report for review!

Next Annual Update Due: November 2007

Next Comprehensive Community Plan Due: November 2009

Date of Community Consultant Review: 12/27/2006

Disclaimer:

You agree that the information provided within this Plan is subject to the following Terms and Conditions. These Terms and Conditions may be modified at any time and from time to time; the date of the most recent changes or revisions will be established by the Commission and sent electronically to all Local Coordinating Councils.

Terms and Conditions:

The information and data provided is presented as factual and accurate. I hereby acknowledge that I can be asked to submit proper documentation regarding the data submitted within the Plan. Failure to do so could result in a "denied approval" by the Commission under IC 5-2-6-16.

The Local Drug Free Communities Fund must be spent according to the goals identified within the plan. I hereby acknowledge that I can be asked to submit proper documentation regarding funds that are collected, allocated, and disbursed within the county. Failure to do so could result in a "denied approval" by the Commission under IC 5-2-6-16.

Initials: KS



Fayette County LOCAL DRUG FREE COMMUNITIES FUND INFORMATION

- (1) Amount deposited into the drug-free communities fund during the most recent, complete calendar year, per the County Auditor:
 - The Fayette County Auditor's office deposited \$27,941.00 into the LCC's Drug-Free Community Fund from fees collected last fiscal year, January to December of 2005.
 - \$9,618.00 rolled over from unused funds from the previous years.
 - \$37,559.00total amount available for programs and administrative costs for the upcoming fiscal year.
 - \$9,389.00allocated for administrative costs leaving \$28,170.00 available for the upcoming year for programming

(2) Fund allocation by category, including a brief description of the purpose of the grant funding:

A DDI LC A NEEDD OFFICE A	43.6077377	43.6073377
APPLICANT/PROJECT &	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
PROGRAM description	REQUESTED	AWARDED
Prevention/Education		
Connersville Middle School, Cindy Troxell, Parent to	\$150.00	\$150.00
Parent		
Connersville Middle School, Eric Myers, Drug Testing	\$4,070.00	\$4,070.00
Connersville High School, Pam Noble, Drug Testing	\$4,800.00	\$4,800.00
Whitewater Valley Care Pavilion, Rob Judd, Media Lit	\$5,000.00	\$2,450.00
TOTAL(S)	\$14,020.00	\$11,470.00
Treatment/Intervention		
Creative Counseling, Debra Shain, Recovering	\$17,400.00	\$6,709.00
Adolescent Treatment Services		
Connersville High School, Jack Hopkins, Summer TEG	\$600.00	\$600.00
Connersville High School, Jack Hopkins, TEG	\$1,080.00	\$1,080.00
Fayette County Sheriff Department, Billy Wayson,	\$2,750.00	\$1,000.00
Inmate Education Program		
TOTAL(S)	\$21,830.00	\$9,389.00

Criminal Justice Services		
Connersville Police Department, Craig Pennington,	\$1,039.50	\$1,039.50
Alcosensors		
Connersville Police Department, Craig Pennington,	\$502.00	\$502.00
Narco Pouch Squad Pack Kits		
Mike Cerqua, SHOCAP	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Connersville Police Department, Craig Pennington,	\$1,039.50	\$1,039.50
Alcosensors		
Connersville Police Department, Craig Pennington,	\$1,991.50	\$1,991.50
Passive Alcohol Sensor		
TOTAL(S)	\$9,572.50	\$9,572.50

(3) Total amount of dollars allocated with percentages:

CATEGORY	Percentage	DOLLARS APPROVED
Prevention/Education	30%	\$11,470.00
Treatment/Interdiction	24%	\$9,389.00
Criminal Justice Services	25%	\$9,572.00
Administrative	21%	\$8,380.00
TOTAL(S)		\$38,811.00

(4) Describe the grant process and requirements for the grantees:

A request for proposals is published onour local paper and on the local cable channel. Applicants submit their proposals by the stated deadline. The coalition's grant team reviews all proposals and selects recipients based on the project's correlation to our mission and comprehensive plan and the applicant's past history (if any) as a grant recipient. The application process includes an agreement signed by the applicant indicating he/she will attend at least fifty percent of the coalition's meetings and submit a quarterly report on his/her project.

(5) Provide administrative expenses:

EXPENSE	COST
Training	\$900.00
Ads	\$400.00
	\$1,000.00
RRW	\$3,000.00

Awards	\$400.00
	\$600.00
TOTAL	\$8,380.00

- (6) Provide amount of any unused dollars from previous years:
- (7) Additional Comments:

REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY PLAN TO ADDRESS ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND OTHER DRUGS

Date of Submission:	12/27/2006			
County: Fayette		Region:	East Central	
Next Plan Update Due	November 2007	Next Full CCP	Due:	November 2009
LCC Name: Fay	yette County Drug Prevention Coalition			
Contact: Kat	thryn Schlichte	Phone:	765/825-70	47
	12 N. Winding Creek Road nnersville, IN 47331	Fax:		
		E-Mail:	rkslick@v	verizon.net
Address of County	Commissioner:			_
-	1 Central Avenue nnersville, IN 47331			
PLAN	Does this section adequately serve as a stand-	alone document	summarizing th	ne community's planning process
SUMMARY				
	Yes ⊠ No □			
	Is The LCC background sufficiently detailed, including its history, geographic coverage, and previous community			verage, and previous community
	coordinating efforts? Yes ⊠ No □			
	Is there a complete description of the LCCs role in monitoring the comprehensive plan (not limited to Local Drug-Fre			ve plan (not limited to Local Drug-Free
Communities Funds)?		Yes	⊠ No □	
How could this section be improved? One option would be to say more about what specifically they will do once the review the plan on a quarterly basis. Will they take action on items or simply review it?				
I feel this section could be improved by noting how they plan on implementing the CCP. They talk about the history and what the problems are; however, there is no description of how they are going to address these issues or improve membership due to the decreasing membership.				

LCC MEMBERSHIP	Is the membership list a realistic description of the acting LCC?		
	Yes ⊠ No ☐ If NO, explain		
	Mark how many members represent each of (only one category per member sh		
Youth	Parent	Religion	_ Civic Organization
7 Treatment	Medicine	Business	_ Local Government
Media	_8_ Education	Self Help	_ Judiciary/Probation
6 Law Enforcement	Labor1_	Other (describe) CITIZEN	
LOCAL DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES FUND			
OOMMONTILE TO TO	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	C'a tha area to a said ('a sail a said	\$27.044.00
	How much was deposited into the LDFCF	•	\$27,941.00
	Is there a report of the most recent years	allocations of the LDFCF?	
			Yes ⊠ No □
	Was a minimum of 25% appropriated to e	ach of the three priority categories	es?
			Yes ⊠ No □
	How could this section of the plan be important	roved?	
Some of the monies that the	ney consider administrative costs are	actually prevention costs:	such as the \$3,000
for the Red Ribbon Week	event they do. With the administrative	e costs being under the 25	5% it isn't too big of a
fit into according to the exp	etter represent their funding to list tho bense.	se types of costs into the	category in which they
The line door all g to the oxp	, chico.		
PROGRESS UPDATE	Does the Progress Update adequately des		of the problem areas and
	recommended actions identified in the prev	nous years plan!	Yes ⊠ No □
	Suggestions:		
	Caggoonono.		
	b of stating what they have done ove d knows how to compile all the data		
over the past year.	a knows now to compile all the data	to represent what the coal	mon nas accomplished
• •			

PROBLEM STATEMENT	How many problem statements are included in this Comprehensive Plan? 3
SECTION	For each problem statement, places complete and attack a constate review sheet
	For each problem statement, please complete and attach a separate review sheet.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	Please include any additional comments pertinent to the planning process of this LCC. These can be suggestions to the LCC for improvement, comments on areas of achievement, or comments to the state on circumstances relating to the LCC and its process that should be kept in mind when reviewing the plan.
sessions during two of their data they had been able to has significant drug probler	oming up with this plan. They own the plan. The coalition as a whole held work most recent meetings where they split into groups and worked on compiling the pull together, review it and create the need statements from that. Fayette County ns over all and it was impossible for them to focus in on one drug; I encouraged this, e broad statements to be able to work on any and all drug issues that might arise
REGIONAL SIGNOFF Recogn	nizing the above and attached comments, I do ⊠ do not recommend □
SIGNOFF	mprehensive Community Plan be approved, for3 years.
	Kim Linkel 12/27/06
Col	mmunity Consultant Date

PROBLEM STATEME	Is this a clear statement of the problem being addressed? Yes \(\text{No} \)	
	(make certain that it is not merely addressing a need, but speaks to the true underlying problem) If NO, what are some suggestions for improving the problem statement?	
SUPPORTIVE DATA	Does the supportive data speak directly to the problem? Yes ☒ No ☐	
	Is the supportive data measurable? Yes ⊠ No □	
	How could this section be improved? Is there any other data that could be included?	
	ood; they could strengthen it by stating exactly who is reporting it as well as having more porting on more years, we can track trends and other usage within the schools and	
RECOMMENDED	How many recommendations are listed for addressing this problem?	
ACTIONS	Does each recommendation appropriately address the problem? Yes ⊠ No □	
	If NO, what changes would you suggest?	
EXPECTED	Do the expected results relate directly back to the stated problem? Yes ⊠ No □	
RESULTS	Are the expected results measurable? Yes ⊠ No	
	If NO, what changes would you suggest?	
	curable, but with the IPRC survey only given every three years, they will only have updated a goals one time during the entire usage of this CCP. I will encourage them to find additional ways ses for this goal.	

PROBLEM # 2

PROBLEM STATEMENT		Is this a clear statement of the problem being addressed? Yes ⊠ No □		
		(make certain that it is not merely addressing a need, but speaks to the true underlying problem) If NO, what are some suggestions for improving the problem statement?		
SUPPORTIVE DATA		Does the supportive data speak directly to the problem? Yes ☒ No ☐		
		Is the supportive data measurable? Yes ⊠ No □		
		How could this section be improved? Is there any other data that could be included?		
		I a number of those needing the services. I am not exactly sure how they would to show there is a lack of services, we need to show there is an additional		
RECOMMENDED	recommendations are listed for addressing this problem? 5			
ACTIONS	Does each	n recommendation appropriately address the problem? Yes ⊠ No □		
If NO, what changes would you suggest?				
	ii ivo, wiie	tt changes would you suggest:		
EXPECTED	Do the exp	pected results relate directly back to the stated problem? Yes ⊠ No □		
RESULTS	Are the ex	pected results measurable? Yes ⊠ No		
		t changes would you suggest?		
		e number of people who complete a treatment program instead of listing how many rtant for people to complete and not just attend; so this is a great number to compile.		

PROBLEM # 3

PROBLEM STATEMENT		Is this a clear statement of the problem being addressed? Yes ⊠ No □		
		(make certain that it is not merely addressing a need, but speaks to the true underlying problem) If NO, what are some suggestions for improving the problem statement?		
This is the problem; however I am not 100% sure that the coalition can have a true impact on adding law enforcement to the streets. I think they need to focus on the resources available to them instead of the number actually going to be on the streets. I would have also liked for them to be more specific on which drugs; but it is a wide spread problem, so it was impossible for them to focus on one or two drugs.				
SUPPORTIVE DATA		Does the supportive data speak directly to the problem? Yes ⊠ No □		
		Is the supportive data measurable? Yes ⊠ No □		
		How could this section be improved? Is there any other data that could be included?		
The data definitely sho	ows a rise	in the arrests over the past year or so; and this is one of the main concerns of		
RECOMMENDED	How man	y recommendations are listed for addressing this problem? 4		
ACTIONS	Does eac	oes each recommendation appropriately address the problem? Yes ⊠ No □		
	If NO, who	at changes would you suggest?		
Their largest need is for additional involvement from Law Enforcement and the Judicial System. They are lacking Probation, Community Corrections, Prosecutor or anyone directly related to the courts.				
_ identify i research, con	······································	serious, resocutor or any one ancour, related to the search		
EXPECTED	Do the ex	pected results relate directly back to the stated problem? Yes ⊠ No □		
RESULTS		xpected results measurable? Yes ⊠ No		
		f NO, what changes would you suggest?		
	ii NO, wh	at changes would you suggest?		
By seeing a decrease in arrests, doesn't truly mean there is a decrease in drug use; there are many factors that go into that. However, that will be there best way they can track for now.				